

By



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,178	12/27/2000	Takuya Uchiyama	1614.1108	2991
21171	7590	08/18/2005	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			AWAD, AMR A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2675	

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/748,178

Applicant(s)

UCHIYAMA, TAKUYA

Examiner

Amr Awad

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29, 33 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loudon et al. (US patent NO. 6,556,712; hereinafter referred to as Loudon) in view of Wolfe et al. (US patent NO. 6,037,930; hereinafter referred to as Wolfe).

As to claim 1, Loudon teaches a coordinate detection device, comprising:
an input unit (computer system 100 in figure 2), having a surface (tablet 50 in figure 3) thereof, to which a coordinate value is input by an input means device (handwriting input device 125 in figure 2); a calculation unit calculating a distance between coordinate values of previous and current input operations by said input unit (for that, Loudon shows that two strokes are interpolated between by providing interpolated points between consecutive strokes, and that the number of points added for connecting the two strokes are based on the distance between the two strokes) (col. 12, lines 21-34), the coordinate values being successive over detachment of the input means device from the surface of said input unit (because Loudon shows that the distance are between two consecutive strokes).

Loudon does not specifically teach calculating the distance between a final coordinate value of a previous operation and a beginning coordinate value of a current input operation, wherein the distance calculated by the calculation unit is transmitted to a host apparatus so as to prevent the current input operation from being connected to the previous operation on the display.

However, Wolfe (figure 1) teaches a multimode touch sensitive peripheral device, that includes a mouse mode, an absolute mode, a joystick mode and numeric keypad mode, wherein when the device is in an absolute mode (figures 1 & 12), a pair of X, Y coordinates from the sensor pad (for example, location x1 in figure 1) are obtained (step 3 of figure 12), and then a decision is made (step 5) whether X, Y coordinates represent the first point since the pad was touched, and if yes, it moves to step 6 to decide whether the pad just been released, and then if yes, it reaches step 9, where the vector (i.e., distance) between the last and the current X, Y coordinates is calculated, and wherein the last X, Y coordinate is saved as the last coordinate point (col. 5, lines 28-36 and col. 8, lines 33-67) (note that the text of col. 8, lines 33-67 corresponds to the mouse mode, however, the step numbers in both figures 11 and 12 are similarly used). As seen in the absolute mode, the distance (vector between the two coordinates) is used in an absolute mode to prevent the current input from being connected to previous operation by designating the current X, Y as the last coordinate point.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Wolfe calculating the distance between the last and the current touch, and considering the current X, Y

Art Unit: 2675

coordinate as the last coordinate point, to be incorporated to Loudon's device so as to be able to use the device in absolute mode as well as other modes, and therefore, increase the versatilities of the device.

As to independent claims 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29, 33 and 37, the claims are substantially similar to independent claim 1, and would be analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

3. Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12, 14-16, 18-20, 22-24, 26-28, 30-32, 34-36 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loudon and Wolfe as applied to claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29, 33 and 37 above, and further in view of Maxted (US patent NO. 6,340,967).

As to claims 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, 30, 34 and 38 as can be seen above, Loudon and Wolfe teach all the limitations of the claims except the citation of determining an operation mode as a relative mode or an absolute mode of the input unit, and control unit that enables or disables the setting unit based on determination result of the determination unit.

However, Maxted teaches a pen based edit correction interface method and apparatus (title), wherein the device includes plurality of modes (one can be called absolute mode or relative mode) (col. 3, lines 26-39), and based on the determination result on the determination unit, a control units enables or disables the setting (for that, Maxted shows that if the tip of the pen is kept within predetermined distance from the last stroke, the mode will change) (col. 10, line 62 through col. 11, line 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Maxted having multiple modes, to be incorporated to Loudon's device so as motivated by Maxted, by dividing functions into different modes, the reliability of recognition of the stroke will be increased (col. 3, lines 35-37).

As to claims 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31, 35 and 39; as discussed above, Maxted shows that the mode changes based on the distance between strokes (col. 10, lines 62, through col. 11, line 10).

As to claims 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32, 36 and 40, Maxted shows that mode changes based on the time (abstract).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2675

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amr Awad whose telephone number is (571) 272-7764. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on (571)272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A.A

AMR A. AWAD
PRIMARY EXAMINER

